REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated February 20, 2007. In the Office Action:

1. The Specification was objected to;

2. Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph;

3. Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC §101;

4. Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC §102; and

5. Claims 1-9 and 13-25 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a).

By this Amendment, claims 10-13 are cancelled. Currently pending claims 1-9 and 14-25 are believed allowable, with claims 1, 14 and 17 being independent claims.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification was objected to for allegedly containing embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable code. Office Action, item 7. The Office Action requests deletion of embedded hyperlinks.

Examiners are required to review patent applications to ensure that hyperlinks and other forms of browser-executable code, especially commercial site URLs, are not included in a patent application. MPEP 608.01. Examples of a hyperlink or a browser-executable code are a URL placed between these symbols "< >" and http:// followed by a URL address. *Id*. It is respectfully noted that inclusion of URLs in the Specification is not prohibited by the USPTO, as long the URLs are not hyperlinks or in the form of browser-executable code.

Although the Specification includes URLs directing the reader to information that may be useful in reviewing the present application, these URLs are not placed between "< >" symbols or are in any other browser-executable form. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification does not contain an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §§ 101, 102 and 112

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph and 35 USC §101. Office Action, items 8-11. Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC §102. Office Action, items 12 and 13. By this Amendment, claims 10-13 are cancelled from the present application. Thus, the rejections of claims 10-13 under 35 USC §§ 101, 102 and 112 are moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-9 and 13-25 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,251 issued to Crocket et al. in view of "WinZip Self-Extractor Personal Edition", pg. 1-7 ("WinZip").

"As an initial matter, Office personnel should determine the scope and content of the relevant prior art. Each reference must qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 . . . ." MPEP 2144.08, citing Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co., 810 F.2d 1561, 1568, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1597 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicants respectfully submit there is no evidence in the record that WinZip qualifies as prior art against the present application. Specifically, WinZip does not contain any indication of publication before the priority date of the present application. Furthermore, no date of publication is provided in Form PTO-892 for WinZip accompanying the Office Action.

For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claims 1-9 and 14-25. The Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 and 14-25.

CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this case is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain at issue that the Examiner feels could best be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below.

No fee is believed due with this Amendment, however, should a fee be required please charge Deposit Account 50-0510. Should any extensions of time be required, please consider this a petition thereof and charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 21, 2007

Ido Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924
Law Office of Ido Tuchman
82-70 Beverly Road
Kew Gardens, NY 11415
Telephone (718) 544-1110
Facsimile (866) 607-8538